

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 6 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Johnston, et al. It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over Johnston for the reasons set forth below.

As set forth in Applicants' Figure 1, electrode 12 is situated along the shorter side of Applicants' resistor.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 6, thus includes the feature of:

. . . forming a pair of electrodes on a substrate having a width shorter than a length of said substrate . . .

This feature is supported by Applicants' Figure 1. No new matter has been added.

This is different than Johnston where the substrate is shown as a square. Allowance of Claim 6 (and claim 10 dependent thereon) is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 6, 10, 11, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Edwards, Jr., et al. It is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable over Edwards for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' claim 1 recites the feature of:

. . . a substrate having a width shorter than a length . . .

. . . a pair of electrodes disposed on said substrate . . . along a substantial portion of said width . . .

As this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Edwards, claim 1 is patentable over Edwards.

Claims 6 and 11, while not including the same wording as claim 1, are similarly allowable.

Applicants' claim 1 recites a further feature of:

. . . said resistor element comprising side sections, each of said side sections connected to each of said pair of electrodes along a substantial portion of a length of said pair of electrodes . . .

This is different than Edwards. Figure 1 of Edwards simply shows wire 24 connected to electrode 20 at a point. This is different than claim 1 where the resistor element is connected to the electrodes along a substantial portion of a length of the electrodes. For this reason, claim 1 (and claim 6 and 11) are allowable over the art of record.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, 13 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston in view of Collins. As previously explained, however, Johnston's substrate is square. By contrast, Applicants have claimed a substrate with a width shorter than a length. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-5, 8, 12 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston in view of Collins and further in view of Solow. These claims, however, include the features of the respective independent claims for which they depend. Thus, these claims are also allowable over the art of record.

MAT-8140US

~~Respectfully submitted,~~

~~September 15, 2004~~